

1 forwarded the results of her review to Teri Thompson, Director of Classification and Compensation.
2 By letter dated January 29, 2002, Ms. Thompson notified Appellant that his position was properly
3 allocated to the Electrician-High Voltage classification. On February 27, 2002, Appellant filed
4 exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's
5 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6
7 Appellant is responsible for performing work installing and repairing high voltage electrical
8 distribution systems. He installs and repairs switches, transformers and cables, reads blue prints
9 and orders materials for high voltage jobs. Appellant also trains and directs journey-level
10 electricians on work involving high voltage systems. During the hearing before the Board,
11 Respondent stated that the University compensates employees who, in addition to their regularly
12 assigned duties, are occasionally assigned to perform higher-level work. Appellant acknowledged
13 that this was the practice, but stated that he did not regularly submit the paperwork necessary for
14 compensation as a lead.

15 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant contends that he performs lead work on a regular
16 basis but admits that he does not perform lead duties on a daily basis. Furthermore, Appellant
17 argues that he is the designated lead on projects to satisfy requirements set forth by the Department
18 of Labor and Industries (L&I). Appellant asserts that his position should be reallocated to the
19 Electrician Lead-High Voltage classification.

20
21 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent acknowledges that Appellant occasionally
22 performs lead duties but argues that these duties constitute less than 40 percent of Appellant's time.
23 Respondent asserts that Appellant does not meet the definition of a lead on an ongoing basis.
24 Respondent argues that when Appellant is assigned special projects or lead duties, he is
25 compensated for those duties. Respondent further argues that L&I requirements do not meet the

standards for allocation to a lead classification. Respondent contends that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Electrician-High Voltage classification

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Electrician-High Voltage classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Electrician-High Voltage, class code 5337, and Electrician Lead-High Voltage, class code 5344.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

WAC 251-01-255 defines a lead worker, in part, as, "[a]n employee who, in addition to his/her other duties, has responsibility regularly to assign, instruct and check the work of others as a significant part of his/her work responsibilities. . . ." (Emphasis added.)

The definition of the Electrician Lead-High Voltage classification states, "[l]ead and work with high voltage electricians to perform journey-level electrical work in the operation and maintenance of high voltage distribution systems." The distinguishing characteristic state, "[r]egularly assign, instruct and check the work of journey high voltage electricians. Positions in this class are

1 distinguished by requirement to perform skilled operation, maintenance, repair and installation
2 work on high voltage electrical power transmission/distribution cables and equipment."

3
4 Appellant does not regularly assign, instruct and check the work of journey-level high voltage
5 electricians as a significant part of his work responsibilities. Rather, Appellant assumes lead
6 responsibilities less than 40 percent of the time. The Electrician Lead-High Voltage classification
7 does not describe the majority of the ongoing duties and responsibilities assigned to Appellant's
8 position.

9
10 Appellant's duties and responsibilities are consistent with the duties envisioned by the Electrician-
11 High Voltage classification. Therefore, his position is properly allocated.

12
13 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the
14 Director, dated January 29, 2002, should be affirmed.

15
16 **ORDER**

17 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
18 denied and the Director's determination, dated January 29, 2002, is affirmed and adopted. A copy
19 is attached.

20 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2002.

21
22 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

23 _____
24 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

25 _____
26 René Ewing, Member